

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, and 10-14 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

Claim 6 has been canceled and claims 2, 5, and 8 have been amended. Specifically, independent claims 2 and 8 have been amended to more clearly define the signal line change over feature. Claim 5 has been amended to incorporate claim 6, as well as revising the signal line change over feature as revised in claims 2 and 8. The informality contained in claim 5 also has been removed. No new matter has been introduced.

Allowed Claims

Claims 1, 3, 11, 12, and 14 have been allowed.

Art Rejection

Claim 2, 5-8, 10, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Cohen (USPGP 2003/0031333).

As acknowledged by the examiner, Cohen would not have taught determining whether the speakers are out of their positions based on a predetermined relative position relationship of the speakers (i.e., the relationship of the speakers) stored in a storage area. But according to the examiner, this would have been obvious. Applicant disagrees, but even if the examiner's position were deemed to be correct for argument's sake, Cohen still would not have taught correcting the incorrect relationship by swapping the signals of the signal lines output from the amplifier.

Independent claims 2, 5, and 8 now clarify swapping signals of signal lines output from an amplifier to the speakers between at least a pair of speakers that are incorrectly positioned to correct an incorrect layout of the speakers when stored positions of the speakers are out of a predetermined relative position relationship of the speakers.

According to this claimed feature, for example, referring to paragraph 73 of the published application (USPGP 2007/0133813), if the main speakers SP-L and SP-R are inversely disposed (e.g., SP-L positioned on the right side and SP-R positioned on the left side), the L and R signals are swapped with each other. This allows the speaker SP-L to correctly output the R signal and the speaker SP-R to output L signal.

Applicant submits that Cohen would not have taught swapping signals to correct the speaker relationship as set forth in the independent claims.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, and 10-14 are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

17 FEBRUARY 2010

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS, REG. NO. 34,079

P.O. Box 826
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)